



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
08/835,419	04/09/1997	ARTHUR P. FRAAS		5023

7590 06/10/2003
JAMES C WRAY
1493 CHAIN BRIDGE ROAD
SUITE 300
MCLEAN, VA 22101

EXAMINER

DOROSHENK, ALEXA A

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1764

DATE MAILED: 06/10/2003

21

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Advisory Action

Application No.

08/835,419

Applicant(s)

FRAAS ET AL.

Examiner

Alexa A. Doroshenk *ADD*

Art Unit

1764

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 21 May 2003 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.

PERIOD FOR REPLY [check either a) or b)]

- a) ☒ The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
b) ☐ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

1. ☐ A Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.
2. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:
(a) ☐ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
(b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);
(c) ☐ they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
(d) ☐ they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: _____

3. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.
4. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
5. ☒ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☒ request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: see continuation sheet.
6. ☐ The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.
7. ☐ For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) ☐ will not be entered or b) ☐ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: _____

Claim(s) objected to: _____

Claim(s) rejected: _____

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____

8. ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is a) ☐ approved or b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
9. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). _____.
10. ☐ Other: _____

uation Sheet

Applicant's arguments filed May 21, 2003 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

2. In response to applicant's argument that the prior art neither teaches nor suggests that oxygen embedded in the coal itself is a problem nor suggests a solution to such, the fact that applicant has recognized another advantage which would flow naturally from following the suggestion of the prior art cannot be the basis for patentability when the differences would otherwise be obvious. See *Ex parte Obiaya*, 227 USPQ 58, 60 (Bd. Pat. App. & Inter. 1985).

Selep and Dospoy et al.

3. In response to applicant's argument that there is no suggestion to combine the references, the examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988) and *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case, the examiner has provided the Dospoy et al. reference as teaching a coal feeding means known to be effective in the art and holds that the selection of the vibrating coal feeding means of Dospoy et al. for the coal feeding means of Selep is merely the substitution of functionally equivalent structures and that such a substitution is well within the skill of the art and that one of have a reasonable expectation of success in making such a substitution.

Selep and Potter et al.

4. In response to applicant's argument that there is no suggestion to combine the references, the examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988) and *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case, Selep produces a low oxygen content flue gas and Potter et al. is cited as teaching a similar apparatus with a means in which to reuse the same product of Selep, low oxygen content flue gas, in the apparatus.

Selep and Bridle et al.

5. In response to applicant's argument that there is no suggestion to combine the references, the examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988) and *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case, Selep produces non-condensable combustible gases and Bridle et al. teaches wherein the same product of Selep, non-combustible gases, can be recycled to a heating zone and furnace (to burn) and operate as sweep/purge gases (col. 8, lines 54-60).

Selep and Piotter

6. In response to applicant's argument that there is no suggestion to combine the references, the examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988) and *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case, Selep teaches a system with a furnace and a treatment vessel with heating means while Piotter teaches a similar apparatus wherein the heating means comprises ceramic balls are heated and circulated to and from a furnace and a retort. It is held that the substitution of the ceramic ball heating means of Piotter for the heating means of Selep is merely the substitution of functionally equivalent structures and that such a substitution is well within the skill of the art and that one of have a reasonable expectation of success in making such a substitution.

Remaining Arguments

The examiner makes note that the primary basis of the rejections made is with reference and deference to position held and presented by the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences in the Decision on Appeal mailed January 24, 2002. In this decision, the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences has upheld rejections of claims under § 102 and § 103 based on the Selep reference. The claims now pending are basically the claims upheld by the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences with the addition of subject matter previously indicated as allowable. In response to applicant's amendment, such subject matter was found to not be allowable as presented in the rejection of October 9, 2002 and discussed above.

The examiner finds that the remaining arguments in the Response are directed toward subject matter already held by the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences as being anticipated by the Selep reference. Thus, such arguments have been considered but continue to not be persuasive for the same reasons presented by the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences in the Decision on Appeal mailed January 24, 2002.

Marian C. Knode

MARIAN C. KNODE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 1700